

NCLB
Committee of Practitioners
Chandler Unified District
James Perry Administration Center
1525 W. Frye Road
Chandler, AZ
January 09, 2004

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

COP MEMBERS

David Baker	Leticia Lujan
Christine Bejarano	Norma Malamud
Pam Bergstrom	Patricia Marsh
Steve Chambers	Mary McIntyre
Kaye Dean	Lynn Monson
Analizabeth Doan	Ron Neil
Shelly Duran	Joe O'Reilly
Robert Edgar	Patricia Osborne
Tonya Ford	Ronda Owens
Diane Fox	Lucille Schonbrun
Tim Frey	Catherine Steele
Allan Grell	Julie Thayer
Connie Heath	Lynn Thompson
Bruce Iverson	Barbara U'Ren
Joan Johnson	Maureen Ward
Mary Anne Kapp	Maureen West
Bob Klee	Charlotte Wing
Jean Lewis	

ADE

Margaret Garcia-Dugan
Karen Butterfield
Janet Chin
Nadine Groenig
Ildi Laczko-Kerr
Tee Lambert
Carrie Larson
Muriel Rosmann
Janice Smith
Nancy Stahl

GUESTS

Michelle Bailey
Dr. James Murlless
Janet Sullivan

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

COP co-chair, Norma Malamud, called the meeting to order at 9:07 am. Tim Frey, Chandler Unified Federal Programs Director, welcomed members and guests to the James Perry Administration Center. Mr. Frey introduced Susan Eissinger, Assistant Superintendent of Chandler Unified. Ms. Eissinger welcomed everyone and expressed her appreciation of the committee member's commitment. Norma then proceeded to have members introduce themselves.

DISTRICT AYP/ACCOUNTABILITY ISSUES - Ildi Laczko-Kerr and Garrett Holm

Ildi Laczko-Kerr described the appeal process. Ildi explained that all districts can appeal their AYP rating regardless of data verification. The deadline for appeals is January 16th at 5:00 pm. January 30th districts will receive final AYP designation. There is an embargo on the AYP designations; members were warned not to share at this time. Districts can find more detail on how to file an AYP appeal process on the common log at the ADE web site.

I:\ACAD_ACH\COP\COP Archive\COP Jan 2004 Minutes.doc

An explanation of how a LEA can fail to make AYP even when their individual schools do was given.

- ❑ LEAs are scored in a similar manner as individual schools
- ❑ LEAs include mobile students within their district as well as new and exiting students
- ❑ There is a 1% cap on AIMS A for LEAs but there was not a cap for individual schools (NCLB mandated 1% of grade level enrollment)
- ❑ A very liberal appeal process exists for individual schools – however the data still holds for LEAs
- ❑ The n-count for disaggregated students is still 30 for LEAs

It was then explained on what happens if the LEA doesn't make AYP.

- ❑ ADE is in the process of making policy decisions about existing LEAs on improvement under the old "extracted items" system
- ❑ LEAs that do not make AYP for 2 years will have to write an LEA improvement plan similar to a school improvement plan
- ❑ LEAs that do not make AYP for 4 years will be identified for corrective action

The concern that Arizona, as well as a majority of the states, will not make their State AYP was expressed.

ADE will notify LEAs on AYP status on January 30, 2004. It was suggested that ADE hold in depth training on the appeal process.

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT DIVISION – Nancy Konitzer

Nancy introduced Karen Butterfield the new Deputy Associate Superintendent of Innovative and Exemplary Programs. Karen explained some of the issues that she is working on:

- ❑ Identifying criteria and indicators for best practices for school effectiveness
- ❑ Developing recognition awards for examples of best practices, envisioning using Gold – Silver – Bronze levels
- ❑ Hiring a Stay in School Program Specialist, Rhonda St. Louis

ADE has extended the deadline for filing the NCLB Final Consolidated Plan to March 30, 2004. In order to address the concerns of LEAs, a rubric has been developed that will be shared with the LEAs to assist in filling out their plans. LEAs that have already turned in their plans can leave them and we will evaluate or they can notify ADE and stop the evaluation, review their plan using the rubric as a guide and resubmit. It will be their choice. Workshops will be held, around the state, where ADE will go over the NCLB Consolidated Plan and how to use the rubric. The dates for the workshops along with the rubric can be found on the ADE web site.

ADE will be piloting a joint monitoring with Exceptional Student Services (ESS) this spring where a team will go out to 8 LEAs and monitor both ESS and NCLB programs. Program specialists will be using the On Site Review Protocol for NCLB. LEAs will be notified that they will be involved in the joint monitoring. There will be an assessment on how joint monitoring worked for LEAs as well as for ADE.

NCLB monitoring is evolving into a 6-year cycle, with specific steps being handled each year between LEAs and their ADE program specialist. This will help provide consistency between LEAs and ADE in evaluating the creation, implementing, reviewing and updating of the LEAs NCLB Final Consolidated Plans and eliminate the confusion in understanding federal expectations.

TECHNOLOGY/ DATA – Nancy Konitzer

Superintendent Horne is developing newsletters to be sent via e-mail, one for the public and one for educators. ADE will be sending out newsletters to stakeholders, including the current e-mail groups and anyone who requests to be added to the circulation list. The COP members agreed to be included in the distribution of the newsletter. ADE departments will be contributing articles to educators.

There is a letter going out to LEAs asking them to place Program Director's names and email addresses in the LEA Core Data in the Common Logon on the ADE Web site.

Nancy distributed a letter going out to LEAs outlining the policy decisions made regarding data collections and reporting for both LEAs and the ADE. It explains why ADE requires all this information. ADE is attempting to alleviate the reporting burden of the LEAs. ADE will handle federal requests for information. LEAs need to keep the data current and not wait for a stated deadline when the data is due. State statute indicates that data needs to be updated once every 20 days, guidance suggests once every 10 days. It is important that data is current as it is used to determine allocations as well as for AYP, AZ LEARNS and the NCLB Consolidated Final Plan. As a point of interest, it was pointed out all NCLB letters that are sent to LEAs are numbered for identification. You can retrieve them from the web site. The letter also talks about the LEA's responsibility to keep up-to-date e-mail addresses with ADE. LEAs can update e-mail addresses by accessing the LEA Core Data application in the Common Logon menu.

A question was asked about the best software system that matches ADE's SAIS system. Nancy explained that ADE cannot recommend software but can provide a list of vendors who qualify. She also encouraged LEAs to fill out an online survey at the ADE web site.

COMMITTEE OF PRACTITIONERS' ROLE - Discussion

In light of the questions surrounding AYP and other issues, it was suggested that the COP give ADE direction on providing more training statewide. This brought on a discussion of the role of the Committee of Practitioners. According to NCLB, Section 1903 – the COP's role is to advise the State in carrying out its federal responsibilities. This includes providing input and making recommendations on NCLB issues.

SOLUTIONS TEAMS – Dale Parcell

Carrie Larson introduced Associate Superintendent of the School Effectiveness Division Phyllis Schwartz and the Deputy Associate Superintendent of School Improvement, Dale Parcell. Phyllis talked

about the different areas that work towards providing assistance to Arizona's schools. Standards-Based Teaching and Learning, headed by Deputy Associate Superintendent Marie Mancuso; Best Practices, headed by Deputy Associate Superintendent Cheryl Lebo; and School Improvement, headed by Deputy Associate Superintendent Dale Parcell. She explained that Solution Teams would be working with schools that will be eligible for intervention for the first time in Arizona.

Phyllis turned the presentation over to Dale who took COP through a PowerPoint presentation explaining how schools are identified for Solutions Team to work with. LEAs have a fear that the ADE will take over their schools. It was explained that ADE's approach is more of an intervention.

Solution Teams are comprised of master teachers, fiscal analysts, and curriculum/assessment experts who are certified by the State Board of Education as Arizona Academic Standards Technicians.

As of October 2003 there were 82 schools that had their second year of receiving an underperforming rating. An ADE Solutions Team will visit the schools. The Solutions Team will do a 3-day site visit to review and analyze achievement data. They will conduct interviews, classroom observation and focus group discussions. They will work from the Standard and Rubrics for School Improvement, which can be found at www.ade.az.gov/schooleffectiveness. The team will then produce a "Statement of Findings" that will validate or redirect the school's improvement efforts and offer specific recommendations for moving forward. The "Statement of Findings" establishes a framework for support. ADE will be asking LEAs to submit a plan of how they will support their school.

It was suggested that when Solution Teams found positive strides they would inform the COP Committee who would like to add their voice in acknowledging LEA's successes. It was also recommended that ADE create a web page posting successful strategies to share with other LEAs.

SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICE PROVIDERS – Nancy Konitzer

Concerns were addressed trying to contact supplemental providers. Is ADE updating the list of providers and standardizing contract for supplemental providers? Nancy shared that Kim Strehlow is currently recruiting providers and will be keeping the list updated on the ADE web site. If you are having problems with any supplemental providers contact Kim at 602-542-2014 and let her know, she may be able to help you address your concerns. She is also working on creating a standardized contract. Community and Faith-based organizations are encouraged to become providers. This outreach is coming from the federal government.

MegaConference – Norma Malamud

COP members wanted to provide input to ADE on the MegaConference. There was concern expressed about who the conference is for; is it for administrators, Title I coordinators or teachers? Rural LEAs were concerned about the length of the conference; 3 days is hard to be away from their sites. Having to travel so far was a hardship also. Everyone had comments on facility issues: they felt the facilities were not big enough to handle all the participants during the breakout sessions. Participants had to sit on the floor and there were not enough handout materials for everyone.

There were recommendations made to hold more “Mini Conferences” – maybe in the summer for teachers and a separate conference for ELL teachers. A suggestion was made to target breakout sessions on experience level. A recommendation was made to have County Superintendents provide services for their areas. Technology may be a good way to disseminate information for those who may have travel issues; i.e., videotapes or the use of interactive television.

RECOGNITION OF TITLE I DISTINGUISHED SCHOOL MADISON ROSE LANE – Principal Dr. Linda Califano

Nancy Stahl introduced her fellow team members from the Recognition subcommittee; Kaye Dean, Shelly Duran, Mary McIntyre, Charlotte Wing and Marjorie Carrithers assisted on the site visits. They reviewed 18 applications and participated in 3 site visits. Nancy was pleased to announce the selection of the Title I Distinguished School is Madison Rose Lane. Principal Dr. Linda Califano and her Assistant Principal Patricia Jones were asked to share. Dr. Califano gave a PowerPoint presentation on the components of their application and some of their teaching strategies that have made them successful. Nancy Konitzer then presented Dr. Califano a plaque acknowledging Madison Rose Lane as the 2004 Title I Distinguished School with a promise of a \$1,000 check for her school. Nancy announced to COP that Dr. Califano would be going to the National Title I Conference in February where Madison Rose Lane will be recognized nationally.

COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM GRANT – Janice Smith

Norma Malamud introduced Comprehensive School Reform Coordinator, Janice Smith. Janice explained to COP members that the Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) Grant is a Federal Grant under Title I. Arizona has 88 schools that are eligible to receive the grant. The deadline is January 30th. Janice handed out to all members a CSR Grant Application and a listing of all 88 schools that were eligible. The LEAs must be in compliance to be awarded the grant. The grant is to be used on school improvement plans. It cannot supplant existing programs. Janice explained that with the grant being awarded so late in the school year LEAs will be able to roll the money over to the next year or use it this summer if it supports their school improvement plan.

Norma concluded the meeting with a reminder that at the next meeting will be March 5, 2004 at Paradise Valley Unified District. The subcommittees would meet from 9:00 am to 10:00 am and the general meeting would start at 10:00 am. Carrie Larson informed COP members that the External Facilitator application can be found on the ADE web site and the deadline is February 27, 2004. The meeting was adjourned at 3:12 pm

NCLB
Committee of Practitioners
Paradise Valley Unified District
District Administrative Center
15002 N. 32nd Street
Phoenix, AZ
March 5, 2004

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

COP MEMBERS

Julia Ayres	Joan Johnson
Christine Bejarano	Lucille Lang
Steve Chambers	Jean Lewis
Kaye Dean	Leticia Lujan
Analizabeth Doan	Norma Malamud
Shelly Duran	Patricia Marsh
Robert Edgar	Mary McIntyre
Diane Fox	Joe O'Reilly
Lannie Gillespie	Catherine Steele
Allan Grell	Julie Thayer
Connie Heath	Maureen Ward
Maureen Irr	Charlotte Wing
Marion Jewell	

ADE

Sherry Barclay
Debbie Francis
Nancy Konitzer
Tee Lambert
Carrie Larson
Cheryl Lebo
Bobbie Orlando
Muriel Rosmann
Nancy Stahl

GUESTS

Michael Pospisil

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

COP co-chairs, Maureen Irr and Norma Malamud, called the meeting to order at 9:05 am. Mary McIntyre welcomed COP members to the District Administrative Center of Paradise Valley Unified School District. Ms. McIntyre introduced Dr. Skip Brown, Assistant Superintendent for support services and planning. Dr. Brown welcomed everyone to Paradise Valley "where everyday is a day in Paradise". Dr. Brown thanked everyone for coming out in the rain, which speaks to COP member's commitment to education. Maureen then proceeded to have members introduce themselves.

MONITORING – Bobbie Orlando

Bobbie Orlando, Monitoring Manager, explained a new approach to monitoring LEAs for NCLB. A 6-year cycle is being developed to match monitoring efforts with Exceptional Student Services (ESS). Superintendent Horne wants to consolidate monitoring with other ADE departments to lessen the visits to the LEAs. ESS currently uses a 6-year cycle monitoring program and Academic Achievement is

creating a similar monitoring system. During each year different requirements will be evaluated for compliance. This will take the burden off of the LEAs trying to do everything in one year and encourage them to do annual self-assessment. Bobbie explained how each year of the 6-year monitoring cycle the LEA would address specific components of NCLB requirements. Bobbie broke the members up into small work groups and passed out a work sheet and a listing of requirements that are listed in the NCLB statutes. Their charge was to use the list and discuss which components should be addressed during specific years in the cycle. Members worked in small groups for about 10 minutes. When members finished they shared their recommendations on the NCLB 6-year cycle monitoring program. They also discussed concerns as well as suggestions. Their results are shown in *Appendix A*.

Nancy Konitzer shared that states, nation wide, are going to an integrated monitoring of federal projects. ADE is looking at how other states are addressing the same issue. Nancy also explained the training needed for new specialists to help balancing monitoring responsibilities as well as duties as a program coordinator.

IMPLICATIONS OF ALTERNATIVE GOVERNANCE – Carrie Larson

Carrie handed out an article from Education Week with an article discussing how Michigan is now dealing with 112 schools that have not met AYP for 5 years and are making plans for changes for next year for Alternative Governance. Michigan is opting to either replace school staff or other major reforms, not state take over. Pennsylvania is also in the 5th year. She then explained the timeline for schools that do not meet AYP.

Actions For Schools That Do Not Make AYP

Spring	1 st Year	2 nd Year	3 rd Year	4 th Year	5 th Year	6 th Year
Fall	No Consequences	School Improvement Plan 10% of Title I funding goes towards Professional Development Public School Choice			Restructuring Planning Year	Restructuring <i>Alternative Governance</i>
			Add Supplemental Services	Corrective Action (Choosing from a list of options)		

Carrie explained that schools in corrective action must report monthly. Schools must choose one corrective action from an approved listing. Under the law it is the District's responsibility to offer technical assistance and professional development opportunities to the schools.

Carrie had the members break into 5 small groups to discuss several issues of restructuring/alternative governance. The groups were given a worksheet and legal definitions of Restructuring and Alternative Governance and given a specific issue to address of the 5 different arrangements listed in the law. What are the implications? What would it look like? Would there be difference if it were a rural school vs. an urban school? They spent 20 minutes in small group and then were reconvened to share a few highlights from the issue they were assigned.

Highlights from the group discussions:

Group A. Reopening the school as a public charter school.

- ☐ In rural schools there is not a lot of choice for personnel for a charter school.
- ☐ Does governance change affect site councils?
- ☐ Composition of students might change because regulation changes would cause high mobility.
- ☐ What happens if the “new” charter school makes AYP for a couple of years? Can they rejoin their District?
- ☐ Would the school become a District charter school?
- ☐ Can this new charter school cap their enrollment?
- ☐ What if a LEA is only one school, do they just change their name?

Group B. Replacing all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal) that are relevant to the failure to make AYP.

- ☐ Who should go first? Remove the principal first and change the leadership.
- ☐ Data should be used to choose who should be replaced. Which data?

Group C. Entering into a contract with an entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the public school.

- ☐ The schools M&O dollars would follow the charter and have negative impact to the LEA.
- ☐ ADE should recommend private management companies. Schools would not know whom they should choose.
- ☐ How would you handle the community who would not want to change, but the law says yes?

Group D. Turning the operation of the school over to the State educational agency, if permitted under State law and agreed to by the State.

- ☐ If the state took over would they work through district or local school?
- ☐ Who would handle the funding?
- ☐ Who would address the concerns about individual school’s label affecting kids and their neighborhoods?
- ☐ When dismissing personnel would the state honor the LEA contracts?
- ☐ What happens if the school still fails while under state direction?

- Group E. Any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement that makes fundamental reforms, such as significant changes in the school's staffing and governance, to improve student academic achievement in the school and that has substantial promise of enabling the school to make AYP as defined in the State plan under section 1111(b)(2). In case of a rural local educational agency with a total of less than 600 students in average daily attendance at the schools that are served by the agency and all of whose schools have a School Locale Code of 7 or 8, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary shall, at such agency's request, provide technical assistance to such agency for the purpose of implementing this clause.**
- ❑ There should be separate plans to work with schools, other than the LEA – County might be a better option instead of the State.
 - ❑ County could help work locally to bring in more resources, support and technical assistance.

SEI ENDORSEMENT – Debby Francis

Nancy Konitzer introduced Debby Francis, Title III program specialist. Debby came to share information on Structured English Immersion (SEI) endorsement requirements and to tell members that the State School Board voted to adopt rule proposal designated option 2 concerning SEI. The notice of proposed rule making is filed with the Secretary of State with opportunity for public comment, which will be on May 12, 2004 at 1:30.

Debby then explained the SEI endorsement requirements. All new K-12 who graduate August 31, 2006 or later shall be required to pass 3-credit SEI methods course, within their course of study. All state universities in Arizona and other accredited teacher preparatory programs shall offer the course.

Existing certified teachers, administrators and ELL Coordinators/Directors shall be required to obtain 1 credit hour or 15 clock hours of professional development in SEI methods by August 31, 2006. If they have an English as Second Language/Bilingual Education K-12 endorsement, they are exempt from this requirement.

By August 31, 2010 all certified teachers, administrators and ELL coordinators/directors, regardless of having an English as Second Language/Bilingual Education K-12 endorsement are required to obtain 3-credit hours or 45 clock hour of professional development to maintain their SEI endorsement.

ADE will have a task force who will develop curriculum criteria, which later will be presented to the State Board for approval. ADE is submitting a five-year grant for professional development with the Arizona K-12 Center; if the grant is awarded, the task force will be working over the summer. Their product will be presented to the State School Board for approval. If members had questions they could contact Irene Moreno, Deputy Associate Superintendent for Title III at 602-364-2345. When the task force is formed and dates have been set, members will be notified through the list serve. This will be their chance to add input on curriculum criteria for SEI endorsement.

MEGA CONFERENCE – Nancy Konitzer

Nancy thanked the members for their input at January's COP meeting on the Mega Conference. Along with members comments and comments from the surveys from the conference ADE has decided to hold 4 separate conferences in the future. The 2004 Structured English Immersion Conference will be held at The Wigwam Resort in Litchfield Park, May 19-20, 2004. The focus will be English Immersion Strategies. June 10-11, 2004, The First Annual Quality Teaching and Learning Conference will be held at The Wigwam Resort in Litchfield Park. The topic will be: "The Highly Qualified Educator: Building a Professional Learning Community" this conference is recommended for Principals and Teachers. In the fall or early second semester will be a conference focused on Best Practices. The Mega Conference will be held in November. This conference will be for directors and program directors that will be administering NCLB programs. If members have suggestions on presenters call Nancy Konitzer at 602-542-7470.

ADE is applying for grant with the Wallace Foundation. This grant is for leadership development for leadership at the school level. To be able to develop leadership roles for teachers that want to do more but not necessarily become a principal or be part of administration. The Certification task force is also working on a tiered certification system for teachers; they are working on defining Master Teacher.

There will be a training held for NCLB in Coordinators in August after the 12th. This will be a time for LEA NCLB coordinators to get questions answered, network with each other and to gain a better understanding of the appeal process. Nancy will be forwarding items to members of NCLB issues that come from federal decisions.

A discussion took place on a change from the feds on how to count LEP students. Meeting AYP is based on success of the ELL subgroup. LEAs can appeal if there are students that have not been in a program less than 3 years. ADE is looking at changing the rule on how Arizona counts ELL students that would allow LEAs to count FEP students as ELL for 2 years after making FEP.

Nancy then informed members about business rules for SAIS being on the web for easier access. Click on SAIS, then to go to MIS Bulletin Board. www.ade.az.gov/sais/saisdbdocs.asp The SAIS changes for 2005 are also on the SAIS web page.

STATE SYSTEM OF SCHOOL SUPPORT – Nancy Konitzer

Under NCLB the ADE need to create School Support Teams. This is different than the Solution Teams that work with underperforming school under Arizona Learns. School Support Teams meet the requirements of NCLB Statute - Sec. 1117 which indicates a system for support for all Title I schools, not just schools that are in school improvement.

Nancy asked members to participate in some brainstorming ideas of what kind of areas that could be addressed with School Support Teams. The members identified the following areas that could be addressed with School Support Teams:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prevention (SIP) | <input type="checkbox"/> Needs assessment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SW plan development | <input type="checkbox"/> Parent involvement strategies |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resource allocations; school and LEA | <input type="checkbox"/> Long-term intervention |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Data Management- data driven instructions | <input type="checkbox"/> Leadership |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SBR models (similar demographics) | |

The creation of School Support Teams allows ADE and LEAs to be proactive in helping schools improve. To align schools stated needs with monitoring procedures with technical assistance in areas that there are deficiencies. There could a coordination effort between Solutions Team and School Support Teams.

BEST PRACTICES – Cheryl Lebo

Nancy Konitzer introduced Cheryl Lebo, Deputy Associate Superintendent of Best Practices, School Effectiveness Division. Cheryl described her background of teaching and being a Principal in the Paradise Valley District before joining ADE. She introduced Eugene Judson, Research Assistant, working with Cheryl's division. Cheryl then talked about some of the projects that the School Effectiveness Division is currently working on: Best Practices and how it applies to Arizona Schools and setting up a School Resource Guide, an online site that schools and LEAs can find resources relating to leadership, curriculum and strategies and models that other LEAs and schools have implemented that have been successful.

In effort to define Best Practice, Karen Butterfield, Deputy Associate Superintendent of Innovative and Exemplary Practices, is working with the team from School Effectiveness Division. They are looking at research that will establish criteria, strategies and services that define Best Practices.

Currently, School Effectiveness Division is working on reviewing the statement of findings from the Solution Teams that have been out working with schools. Cheryl shared that there have been some common issues that the Solutions Teams are finding: principals do not know their school improvement plan, when created by an external facilitator; there is a lack of professional development; schools are not using data to drive instruction; there is a lack of regular visits to the classroom with feedback on effective strategies. These issues have created a "disconnect" from the school leadership to successful teacher effectiveness.

There has been a positive feedback on Solutions Teams being comprised of Arizona educators who have a strong background in Arizona unique needs. School Effectiveness Division will be contacting those principals of those schools that have worked with their Solution Teams. These schools will receive ongoing support from ADE, monthly contacts and quarterly contacts after second year.

Cheryl answered questions concerning Scientific Based Research standards. She explained that ADE is working on being able to define SBR standards and connecting them with demographic needs to provide easier resource information for schools and LEAs.

Maureen thanked all the members for coming to the COP Meeting in adverse weather conditions. She reminded everyone that the next meeting will be held at ASU West on May 7, 2004. Carrie Larson reminded members that membership time is coming up and that she would be contacting members if their membership term is expiring and giving them a chance to renew. The meeting was called to adjournment at 3:20 p.m.

Appendix A

Committee Of Practitioners Input On the ESS and NCLB Joint Monitoring - 6 year Cycle

General comments:

- ❑ A compromise schedule for monitoring, perhaps there could be a “modified” system to accommodate this difference.
- ❖ Divide districts into separate groupings:
 - Large schools districts where each department usually has it’s own director - they can handle monitoring both programs at the same time.
 - Small school districts where one person wears “many hats” - they cannot handle monitoring both programs at the same time
- ❑ Provide all monitoring questions electronically to each school – they would respond electronically and the answers would be collated into a self-study at DOE for each school. Monitoring visits would then become observations to determine if the school practicing what it said it was doing. (Accreditation style self-study process)
- ❖ Electronically Submitted
 - Title I LEA Parent Policy
 - Title I School Parent Policy
 - Parent - School Compact
 - Standards Affidavits
 - Parent Request policy re: HQ teachers
 - 4 week notice – teacher is currently not HQ
 - Homeless students policies
 - ELL parent notices (1112(g))
 - School improvement notices
 - Choice options
 - Supplemental services
 - Principal’s attestation of HQ teachers
 - Private school services
 - Poverty criteria – rank ordering
 - TA schools – criteria for services
 - SW – supplementary programs
 - Comparability
 - School prayer policy
 - Set asides (1113(c))

- ☐ A different timeline was offered for consideration.

<i>Year 1</i>	<i>Year 2</i>	<i>Year 3</i>	<i>Year 4</i>	<i>Year 5</i>	<i>Year 6</i>
Policies and Procedures Submitted	Procedures Implemented	LEA Consolidated Plan Review	Self Assessment Preparation for On Site Visit	On Site Visit	Follow up Deficiencies deadline agreed upon
Title I	→				
Title III	→				
Homeless	→				
Poverty	→				
HQ Teachers	→				
	Policies and Procedures	Procedures Implemented			
	Title II	→			
	Title IV	→			
	Title V				
<i>LEA develop</i>	<i>NCLB Specialist</i>	<i>work with LEA</i>			

Suggestions:

- ☐ Change Corrective Action (Year 6) to Deficiencies Corrections
- ☐ Look at the Accreditation Process in development of NCLB monitoring cycle
- ☐ Making sure that steps are being taken all through the cycle that LEAs are meeting the 5 goals of NCLB.
- ☐ ADE contact ASBA when policies and procedures need to be changed. This would help small districts with limited legal budgets. A reminder was made that LEAs cannot just adopt ASBA policies but should use them as a guideline. They also need to be sure to have parents involved on the development of the Title I LEA Parent Policy.

Concerns:

- ☐ A big concern of members is that a joint monitoring where multiple programs such as ESS and NCLB are monitored at the same time would have an adverse impact on smaller districts and Charter schools where one individual wears many hats.

NCLB
Committee of Practitioners
Roosevelt Elementary School District Offices
6000 S. 7th Street.
Phoenix, AZ
September 17, 2004

Meeting Minutes

ATTENDEES:

COP Members:

Norma Malamud - Co-Chair	Armida Hernandez
Joe O'Reilly – Co-Chair	Maureen Irr
Julia Ayres	Marion Jewell
Gerry Baumann	Joan Johnson
Christine Bejarano	Mary Anne Kapp
Karen Burns Copley	Jean Lewis
Harriet Caruso	Leticia Lujan
Steve Chambers	Patricia Marsh
Kaye Dean	Jill Martinez
Analizabeth Doan	Mary McIntyre
Shery Dorathy	Lynn Monson
Tanya Ford	Jacquelyn Power
Diane Fox	Amy Scalf
Timothy Frey	Lynn Thompson
Allen Grell	Barbara U'Ren
Connie Heath	Charlotte Wing

ADE:

Sherry Barclay
Nancy Konitzer
Lois Kruse
Bobbie Orlando
Tee Lambert
Muriel Rosmann
Erika Wesley

Guests:

Shelly Duran
Carrie Larson
Mary Grace Wendel

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Norma Malamud, called the meeting to order at 9:05. Norma introduced herself and welcomed everyone to the first of the 2004-2005 Committee Of Practitioner meetings. She then had members introduce themselves. Analizabeth Doan, assistant superintendent of Roosevelt District welcomed everyone to her district.

ELECTION OF NEW OFFICERS – Maureen Irr & Norma Malamud

Norma explained that the co-chairs for COP serve for two years on an alternating schedule. Maureen had served her two years and she had another year left. Maureen and Norma then asked for nominations from the floor. Joe O'Reilly, Tim Frye, Gerry Baumann and Mary McIntyre were nominated. Joe O'Reilly was elected the new co-chair for the Committee of Practitioners and will serve from 2004-2006. A motion was made that this years nominees would be automatically become nominees for the next year's co-chairs position, not excluding nominations from the floor. There was discussion among members and the motion was withdrawn.

COP GOAL SETTING – Norma Malamud & Joe O'Reilly

Nancy Konitzer stated that she would be asking COP to be working on the Title I Distinguished Schools process. She also spoke about an issue that has been raised at the NCLB Monitoring Training sessions about Time & Effort Logs that auditors are asking LEAs for. Nancy would like COP look at that and provide input on Time & Effort Logs. Nancy expressed that she would like COP to be a working committee working on topics not just listening to presentations. A discussion was held about the purpose of COP. Norma explained Committee Of Practitioners is a group that acts as an advisory committee to ADE. Last year COP provided valuable input on the new 6-year cycle NCLB Monitoring system that was developed.

The committee discussed different issues they would like to focus committee work on. Members wanted to address the concerns and what kind of resources and support that is needed for LEAs and schools are needing trying to meet NCLB requirements and dealing with school and LEA improvement,

The COP members decided on the following committees:

Standing Committees:

- * Membership
- * Distinguished Schools

Ad Hoc Committees:

- * LEA Improvement
- * Years 1-3 of School Improvement
 - ☐ SI Plan development and implementation
 - ☐ Choice
 - ☐ Transportation
 - ☐ Supplemental services
 - ☐ Corrective Action
 - ☐ Meaningful parental involvement
- * Years 4&5 of School Improvement
 - ☐ Meaningful parental involvement
 - ☐ Restructure plan development
 - ☐ Implementing restructure plan (Alternative Governance)

6-Year NCLB COMPLIANCE MONITORING – Bobbie Orlando

Bobbie explained to members that with COP's input the Monitoring Cycle Development (McD) Team developed the 6-year monitoring system that will help LEAs better understand all the different issues that need to be addressed to be in compliance with NCLB. The 6-year NCLB Self Assessment Compliance Monitoring document is a tool that can be used as a resource for LEAs to evaluate all areas beside the cycle that they are currently in. Bobbie walked members through the monitoring document, explaining how the LEAs will complete the checklists and utilize the worksheets. Bobbie also went over the instruction letter that will be sent with each cycle. She explained that every LEA has been assigned a cycle that aligns with ESS's cycles and the NCLB monitoring packets will be sent out in October. They need to be returned to ADE by February 1st. The monitoring packet and references will soon be on the ADE web site.

6-Year NCLB COMPLIANCE MONITORING cont...

Bobbie updated members about a new combined qualitative monitoring document that has been developed for Exceptional Student Services and No Child Left Behind programs. 3 areas were addressed for the pilot monitoring: Parental Involvement; Professional Development and Instructional Delivery. There were 4 LEAs asked to participate in the pilot monitoring: Fort Huachuca Accommodation District, St. Johns Unified School District, Tanque Verde Unified School District and Humboldt Unified School District.

FUTURE MEETINGS – Norma Malamud

Norma confirmed future COP meeting dates and sites:

Wednesday	November 17, 2004	Mega Conference in Tucson
Friday	January 21, 2005	Agua Fria UHSD
Friday	March 4, 2005	Chandler USD
Friday	May 6, 2005	Mesa USD

COMMITTEE WORK

After lunch members broke up into their committees they signed up for to discuss how they wanted to address each committee's focus.

Membership	Title I Distinguished Schools	LEA Improvement	School Improvement Years 1 - 3	School Improvement Years 4 & 5
Steve Chambers	Kaye Dean	Julia Ayers	Gerry Baumann	Kaye Dean
Allen Grell	Maureen Irr	Steve Chambers	Christine Bejarano	Marion Jewell
Joan Johnson	Mary McIntyre	Karen Copley	Harriet Caruso	Robert Klee
Jill Martinez	Charlotte Wing	Analizabeth Doan	Sherry Dorathy	Norma Malamud
Patricia Marsh		Tonya Ford	Patricia Marsh	Amy Scalf
		Diane Fox	Lynn Monson	Lynn Thompson
		Timothy Frey	Jacquelyn Power	
		Allan Grell		
		Connie Heath		
		Maureen Irr		
		Jean Lewis		
		Leticia Lujan		
		Mary Anne Kapp		
		Jill Martinez		
		Mary McIntyre		
		Barbara U'Ren		

MEGA CONFERENCE – Nancy Konitzer

Nancy let members know that the next COP meeting will be a short 2 hour meeting to be held at Mega Conference on Wednesday, November 17th at 4:30 – 6:30 after Wednesday's regular scheduled sessions. COP will meet at the Radisson City Center in Tucson in the Starlight room. COP will work on the Time and Effort Log issue during this meeting.

The opening General Session at the Mega Conference will feature keynote speaker, Dr. Thomas Guskey. Dr. Guskey is Professor of Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation at the University of Kentucky and known by educators around the world for his work in professional development and educational change.

MEGA CONFERENCE cont...

Other featured speakers include Nancy Ichinaga of the Heritage Foundation. When Nancy Ichinaga became principal of Andrew Bennett Elementary in 1974, 95 percent of the children in her school were illiterate. In only four years she raised the school-wide reading performance from the 3rd to the 50th percentile in the state of California. After that achievement kept on climbing and, for 20 years, her school has been one of the highest performers in all of Los Angeles County. A mastery of reading in kindergarten is one of the keys to her success.

Nancy mentioned that if LEAs want to share registration between administrators, Thursday is the day that would benefit principals.

NCLB UPDATE– Nancy Konitzer

Nancy let members know that Arizona Department of Education was going to be audited by the US Department of Education in the spring. They are auditing Title I, Even Start and Neglected or Delinquent. They may want to talk with COP members as well as 2 LEAs to assess how ADE is providing services.

Nancy introduced Ericka Wesley our new Title II coordinator to members. Ericka most recently worked at a Charter school but has worked at the US Department of Education in Title II division.

In the training that is going on in September the focus is on the 6-year self-assessment monitoring for NCLB programs and fiscal applications. There are changes in the application reviews. Nancy encouraged everyone to go back to the directions and look at the application example that was provided. This will help coordinators fill out their applications. The expenditures need to be aligned with the Consolidated Plan and specified if it is a Targeted Assistance or Schoolwide program. Nancy also told members not try to enter student data into SAIS until their application is approved the SAIS system will not accept the data.

Superintendents of LEAs with schools in school improvement will receive a letter summarizing all of their schools that are in school improvement and which year of school improvement that they are in. It will also explain the steps that need to be taken by the schools. Each school principal will also receive a letter.

With LEAs that are in LEA improvement there are three areas of responsibilities that need to happen:

1. The state will notify parents; ADE is currently drafting a parent notification template that the LEA will mail out that ADE will refund the cost of mailing. The requirements that need to be in the letter to parents are: the reason why the LEA was identified as being in LEA Improvement, what parents can do to assist you. The letter will be in Spanish and English.
2. The LEA will develop an improvement plan.
3. The LEA will set aside 10% of their Title I funds for professional development.

Nancy shared with members that Comprehensive School Reform grant money is ending this year. Schools that received funding last year will be funded for all 3 years.

TITLE I DISTINGUISHED SCHOOLS – Sherry Barclay

Sherry is now facilitating Title I Distinguished Schools taking over for Nancy Stahl who has retired. There will be a Title I school chosen based on exhibiting exceptional student performance for 2 or more consecutive years. ADE will research which schools are eligible and notify each school. Once they return their packets, Sherry will gather the Title I Distinguished Schools committee and they will review the applications and choose schools that will have site visits from the members of the committee. Arizona nominees are due to National Association of State Title I Directors (NASTID) by November 17, 2004. The committee hopes to have their selection process done by November 5, 2004.

Before the meeting was adjourned members made a motion and it was passed that they want more information on the duo testing and what that means for AYP and AZLearns labels. A motion was also made and passed to make a recommendation to ADE that they continue to use the scores from 3rd, 5th, 8th and 10th grades for AYP and AZLearns until the duo test has been in place and utilized for a few years before using it as benchmark in assigning labels. COP also recommended that ADE receive input from stakeholders on changing the base line years.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:10 pm.

NCLB
Committee of Practitioners
MEGA Conference
Radisson City Center
Tucson, AZ
November 17, 2004

Meeting Minutes

ATTENDEES:

COP Members:

Norma Malamud - Co-Chair	Maureen Irr
Joe O'Reilly – Co-Chair	Maureen Irr
Julia Ayres	Mary Anne Kapp
David Baker	Robert Klee
Gerry Baumann	Jean Lewis
Christine Bejarano	Patti Lopez
Pamela Bergstrom	Leticia Lujan
Karen Burns Copley	Patricia Marsh
Harriet Caruso	Mary McIntyre
Steve Chambers	Ann Peschka
Kaye Dean	Jacquelyn Power
Tanya Ford	Kathleen Silvers
Diane Fox	Catherine Steele
Timothy Frey	Julie Thayer
Allen Grell	Lynn Thompson
Connie Heath	Barbara U'Ren
	Charlotte Wing

ADE:

Jill Andrews
Sherry Barclay
Bob Coccagna
Debby Francis
Nancy Konitzer
Tee Lambert
Muriel Rosmann
Janice Smith
Kim Strehlow
Erika Wesley

Guests:

Shelly Duran
Daryl Heinitz
Barbara Kohl
Jill White

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Joe O'Reilly and Norma Malamud, called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the November's Committee Of Practitioner meeting. She then had members and guests introduce themselves.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT INFORMATION – Nancy Konitzer

Nancy went over the two handouts on schools in school improvement list. She reminded everyone that there are schools still involved in the appeal process. They will be removed from the list if they win their appeal. The pink copy contains schools in their 1st year of school improvement, which is a warning year. The buff copy contains a list of all schools in school improvement and the year they are in. This copy also indicates schools that are frozen; these are Title I schools that are frozen in the school improvement schedule. When a school in school improvement is frozen it means that they met AYP, they stay at the same level. When they make AYP 2 years in a row they will be removed from the school improvement schedule. If they make AYP 1 year but not the next they will continue on the school improvement schedule. Nancy reminded members that this year the target is higher in making AYP. We have moved from the first plateau to the next for meeting the reading and math targets.

A question was asked about the school improvement money. Nancy explained that NCLB requires set aside for school improvement of the state allocation. It was 2% it is now 4%, \$8.9 million that is to be used for schools in school improvement. It cannot be used for LEA improvement, or schools that are in the warning year of school improvement. There is a discussion at ADE on how to prioritize allocation of funds, now that there are schools in the restructuring phase of school improvement.

Nancy informed members that the state is being audited by USDOE in April and they will be looking at Title I, Homeless and Neglected or Delinquent programs. They want to visit districts with schools in school improvement to audit how well ADE supports the districts. ADE is looking for districts that they can visit. If members have a Homeless or N&D program they would like to showcase please contact Bob Coccagna at 542-4564.

On November 8th Nancy attended a National Title I meeting. She shared that they are setting up an assessment piece for the states on compliance with NCLB. It is a peer review. The labeled results are different this time. There will not be any waivers given; there will be different levels of being compliant with the law. Nancy feels that Arizona is in pretty good shape to go through this assessment. All the states are in the same spot on being in compliance with Special Ed with NCLB.

Committee Work on Restructuring – Nancy Konitzer

Nancy went over previous COP input on restructuring on Alternative Governance. Now we have schools in the restructuring phase of school improvement. School Effectiveness Division will work with schools that are in year 1, year 2 and Corrective Action and they will be responsible for school improvement activities with those schools. The schools identified for Restructuring under the federal system and failing under the state system will work with the Intervention Unit, Tommie Miel is the Deputy Associate. Tommie will be directing her staff on working with those schools.

There are 11 or 12 schools that are identified as failing schools and they received site visits to determine if they were to be presented the state board as failing schools under AZLEARNs and they will receive intervention assistance from the intervention team. The intervention team will also be working with the schools that were identified for restructuring because it is a similar process. The failing schools and restructuring schools will be planning for whatever intervention that will be implemented. The options at the state and federal levels are very similar. The schools in restructuring will receive federal support. Nancy wanted the COP to look at what that would like. Tommie Miel asked COP to provide input on:

- ☐ The role of an External Facilitator?
- ☐ What kind of training at this level would be appropriate for staff, for principal etc.?
- ☐ What kind of grants could be used at his point?

Nancy had members break into 3 groups. Program specialists; Debby Francis, Janice Smith, and Kim Strehlow each took one of the questions and facilitated each group's input. They rotated through each group allowing all members to address each question.

See Appendix A for COP member input.

TIME AND EFFORT LOGS

AD-HOC AND STANDING COMMITTEE

These items on the agenda were tabled and will be addressed at a later date.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 pm